

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP

S 2081

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 16, 1967

talking about it, AID was negotiating more loan commitments, unknown to us.

It is becoming accepted practice for AID, State, Defense, and CIA to tell us not what they are doing, but only what they want us to know.

The issue here is broader than a little disagreement between the Foreign Relations Committee and the administration. This is the same issue almost every committee of the Congress encounters at one time or another. It is part of the trouble this administration is having and will have with this Congress.

I may say that as far as I am concerned, the committee should not have relied upon a polite letter from the chairman to the President protesting this matter. We should have reported forthwith a resolution amending the basic legislation.

Employees of the executive branch seem too often to forget that they are not elected representatives of the people. They act as if their judgment were a substitute for democratic government.

Under these circumstances it is absolutely essential that elected Members of Congress be ready to take off their gloves to fight for the policy decisions which they have embodied in law. Failure to react to usurpations of legislative power will gradually destroy our system. I am not going to become a party to that process.

There is a saying which holds: "Fool me once, your fault. Fool me twice, my fault." Congress has been fooled not once or twice but over and over again in what has become an annual shell game over the AID program. We try to guess which shell the pea is under and no matter which one we pick, the pea is always somewhere else. That is why so many of us remain unimpressed by the advertising for the new aid message. That is why so many of us are beginning to conclude that there are no reasonable guidelines that can be written into the program. Objectives are not enough. The law must be ironclad or we are better off with no law at all. That is my conclusion from this latest episode in which the clear objective of Congress was totally ignored.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has sent to the President a letter expressing the concern of the Committee on Foreign Relations at the decision to increase the number of countries receiving development loans. The letter is unclassified. Copies were sent to each member of the committee. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 8, 1967.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter concerns your determinations of January 5, 1967, received by the Committee on Foreign Relations on January 17, increasing the number of countries eligible for development loans from ten to twenty-nine and for technical assistance and cooperation grants from forty to forty-eight.

The Committee has heard Mr. William Gaud's justification of the action. Unfortunately, because of the press of other business there has not been an opportunity for the Committee to meet to take formal action since his presentation. With the Lincoln Day recess now upon us, the thirty day waiting period will be over before the Committee can consider the matter further. In view of this, I feel that I am obligated to advise you that I personally deplore this action and I believe that many members on both sides of the aisle are also seriously concerned.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

NEW YORK TIMES ENDORSES PRINCIPLE OF S. 981, TO PROVIDE FUNDS THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE FOR TRAVEL TO INTERNATIONAL YOUTH CONFERENCES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, among other consequences of the revelations of CIA involvement in domestic youth groups, it is imperative that there be a thorough housecleaning of the activities of the Federal Government concerning travel subsidies for those attending international conferences in fields such as science and education, activities in which the search for truth is paramount and in which CIA involvement makes a sickening perversion of the educational or scientific aims. These conferences contribute to international understanding and to the advancement of science and education, and it would be a tragedy if Federal support for such activities were to be permanently clouded because of the events of the past few days.

Two things are clear: First, Federal support for travel to these conferences is important. Second, the credibility of Federal support must be established beyond the shadow of a doubt. Credibility in this case means that when a man goes to an international education conference on a Government travel grant, he goes for the purpose of education and not as a spy.

Yesterday I introduced S. 981, a bill to amend the International Education Act of 1966 to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to make grants to finance travel to international youth conferences by individuals broadly representative of the Nation's students.

I am glad to see that today's New York Times has endorsed the principle of my bill in an editorial which states:

It is nonsense to suggest that, because they arouse suspicion abroad, public subsidies should not be offered. Virtually all nations offer such subsidy. The point at issue is how to provide the funds, without perverting the purpose.

A first step should be to speed the divorce, already suggested under the International Education Act of 1966, of international educational affairs from the foreign policy branches of the Government. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is far better suited to sponsor educational exchanges than the State Department, let alone the CIA.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the February 16 New York Times, entitled "Infiltrating the Cam-

pus," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INFILTRATING THE CAMPUS

The impropriety and folly of permitting the Central Intelligence Agency to subsidize the National Student Association cannot be mitigated by post-mortem rationalizing. It is absurd to suggest that, because the student organization was too impoverished to take part in international meetings, the CIA merely assumed the role of a benevolent patron of youth.

It is not the business or the habit of intelligence services to underwrite indigent good causes unless the beneficiary can be expected to pay off the debt, directly or indirectly. It was more reprehensible for Washington to let its intelligence service jeopardize a representative voice of the nation's college youth than it was for a student leader, in secret agreement, to succumb to the temptation.

At least as serious has been the breach of public faith by private foundations acting as go-betweens. The very existence of foundations is a privilege granted by the tax-paying public. The mandate that goes with this tax exemption is to provide nongovernmental support for worthy causes, not to serve as a cover for clandestine Government operations.

The sordid episode has dealt another serious blow to the credibility of American students and scholars abroad. Faith in their detachment already had been damaged by earlier disclosures of secret links between the CIA and some American universities. A total ban on all CIA underwriting of collegiate activity is plainly long overdue.

It will be tragic if the present effect is an undermining of the National Student Association's total record. Often under fire from the right, it has usually represented courageous liberalism. To discredit the organization because of the secret indication of a few of its leaders would sap the strength of elected student governments across the country and endow New Left extremists with unwarranted power just when their hold on students is crumbling.

More is needed now than a halt in CIA subsidies to the N.S.A. or other academic organizations. All such groups should open their books and sources of funds to their own membership and to public scrutiny. To permit a few student leaders to make far-reaching policy decisions without consent of the membership exposes them to pressures and temptations far beyond the scope of their political experience.

As for foundation activities, the penalties for engaging in undercover activities should be clearly established. The Patman investigations long ago made clear the need for reforms, and the President has promised to send to Congress this year proposals for stamping out abuses in foundation practices.

Most important, explicit guidelines should be laid down to regulate all policies of Government support of international activities of students and scholars. It is nonsense to suggest that, because they arouse suspicion abroad, public subsidies should not be offered. Virtually all nations offer such subsidy. The point at issue is how to provide the funds, without perverting the purpose.

A first step should be to speed the divorce, already suggested under the International Education Act of 1966, of international educational affairs from the foreign policy branches of the Government. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is far better suited to sponsor educational exchanges than the State Department, let alone the CIA.

Beyond specific action, it is imperative to understand that academic freedom may be severely threatened by secret covenants as by overt political coercion. Democratic institutions never thrive by using totalitarian devices to combat totalitarianism.

"RESPONSIBILITY AND RESPONSE"—BOOK BY GEN. MAXWELL D. TAYLOR

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I note that Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, now retired, has had published and released a new book called "Responsibility and Response." I look forward to reading it in entirety. Perhaps it has some answers to the terrible problems facing us in Vietnam.

General Taylor was a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Ambassador to Vietnam, and a chief politico-military strategist of both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

I hesitate to quote General Taylor out of context, but several statements in his book caught my eye. One in particular I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate. General Taylor observes:

Suppose everything of value in the North were destroyed; we would still have over 200,000 armed men in North Viet Nam who would be a constant threat for in some way. For they could live off the land without supplies from the North. If they avoided contact with large military forces, they could husband their weapons and ammunition stocks and maintain for a long time a low level of sustained depredations and terrorist activity. If they were determined to carry on the war, if their morale did not collapse at this disaster in the North, they could conceivably remain in action for the next ten years, or in the next twenty years, and we might still be tied down by this vast guerrilla force.

I make a point of quoting the general in context, because many persons in this country write to me and tell me that we should use every weapon at our disposal to "win the war." I do not know exactly what they mean, but I assume they are speaking of unrelenting bombing and invasion to say the least, and atomic warfare to say the most.

I do not think, and I believe General Taylor does not either, that we can win the war in this way. We will eventually have to negotiate.

FUNDS FOR MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I noticed in the letters-to-the-editor column of today's New York Times a letter from Frank Leonard, a graduate student at the Columbia University School of Social Work.

His letter deserves the attention of all of us in the Congress.

He points out, for example, that about 2,000 students seeking grants from the National Institute of Mental Health for training in the mental health field were denied grants because of inadequate funds. This one statistic alone should shock us: We know of the tremendous need for more and better trained mental health personnel, we know of the needs of the mentally retarded and mentally ill or these personnel—yet 1,840 students

seeking training in mental health were in 1965 denied the financial assistance they need for the training. We must, when the opportunity is afforded us this year, increase the appropriations available to the National Institute of Mental Health for the training of students who desire to enter this field.

An article in the December 1966 issue of Psychiatric News, by Michael Gorman, executive director of the Association Against Mental Illness, describes the needs in mental health manpower training, and describes the inadequacy of funding for pursuit of this training.

Another point made in Mr. Leonard's letter is the seriousness of the lack of funds for construction of community mental health centers. About 2,000 community mental health centers are projected for construction across the United States by 1975, at a cost conservatively estimated at \$5 billion. Yet we have appropriated less than \$60 million annually to meet this need. It should be clear that without increased appropriations, we simply cannot hope to meet the goal of 2,000 community mental health centers.

Massachusetts, for example, has planned for the establishment of 38 community mental health centers throughout the State. These centers will diagnose and treat the mentally ill and the mentally retarded where they should be diagnosed and treated—in their own communities. For 36 of the 38 centers planned in Massachusetts, program planning has already begun. But, again, the financial burden on the State is too great for it to bear, unless increased Federal financial assistance is made available.

Let me say in closing, Mr. President, that though the National Institute of Mental Health is doing a superb job, we in Congress have not given it the full box of tools it needs. Mental illness and mental retardation are tragedies, as I pointed out on the floor of the Senate 2 weeks ago, and we must do all we can to ease the pain these tragedies bring to individuals and families.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter in the New York Times and the article in Psychiatric News, to which I have referred, be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

To the Editor:

News stories about the 2,000 community mental health centers that are "projected" for completion throughout the nation by 1975, and the 23 centers that are currently "planned" for New York City, can create a false feeling of optimism about the progress of mental health programs.

Five billion dollars is a conservative estimate of the cost of construction of the 2,000 centers, and \$1.5 billion is a conservative estimate of the annual cost of staff salaries—presuming that the 100,000 psychiatric nurses and 40,000 other professionals could be recruited and trained to staff the centers.

Clearly, the Federal Government must meet most of the costs of implementing the community mental health center idea. The 1961 report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health and Illness, Action for Mental

Health, said Federal contributions for mental health should double in five years (reaching \$940 million annually) and triple in ten years (reaching \$1.75 billion annually).

Only contributions of this magnitude can make community mental health a reality. The much-touted 1963 and 1965 Federal laws make available less than \$100 million annually for a limited number of years.

In addition, last year 2,000 students seeking National Institute of Mental Health grants to obtain training in this field were denied them because of lack of funds.

This year's New York City Community Mental Health Board capital budget for construction of mental health centers was cut from a requested \$38.6 million to \$4.6 million—the greatest cut by far of any city department. At this rate, it would take New York City 31 years to complete 23 centers—half the number required. The pace elsewhere is even slower.

FRANK LEONARD.

FEBRUARY, 9, 1967.

[From Psychiatric News, December 1966]

**HARD-WORKING CONGRESS DID WELL
BY MENTAL HEALTH**

(By Mike Gorman)

THE 89TH CONGRESS, which worked harder and met over a far longer span than most of its predecessors, is now fair game for historians, archivists, and other ex post facto pundits. The recently elected 90th Congress, which will open shop on Jan. 10, will be much more conservative in outlook. For one thing, heavy Democratic majorities in important Committees in the House will be sharply reduced.

Those of us who were in almost daily contact with the 89th Congress know that its actions in the field of mental health alone have earned it the approbation of all who are interested in replacing custodial care of the mentally ill in large mental institutions with early, intensive care in easily accessible community facilities.

The major contribution of the 89th Congress was the passage of an amendment to the 1963 Community Mental Health Centers Act authorizing \$224 million in federal matching monies over seven years to help support the personnel and other operating costs of new community mental health centers.

Despite the predictions of some entrenched prophets of gloom and doom, the community mental health centers program has really gotten off to a most impressive start. As of Nov. 1, 1966, federal matching grants had been awarded for the construction and/or staffing of more than 140 community mental health centers in 44 states. Since many state plans were not approved until earlier this year, all indications point to a flood of applications during 1967. However, the current fiscal year is the last one of the mental health center construction authorization. The National Institute of Mental Health, with the approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is now pushing for a five-year, \$500 million renewal of the mental health center construction act. This will be the toughest task during the 90th Congress, and a particularly severe test for a hopefully revitalized National Association for Mental Health.

A second amendment to the 1963 act, often overlooked, provides for enormous expansion in training teachers of the handicapped. It authorizes \$120 million in federal monies over a four-year period for these teachers of the handicapped, with particular emphasis in both House and Senate reports upon the development of teachers for emotionally disturbed children. This is a crucial need right now, since the Office of Education estimates that there are fewer than 3000 teachers specifically qualified to work with emotionally